## REMARKS

The Office Action of March 20, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully considered. An RCE is being filed concurrently to relieve the application of its finally-rejected status and thereby permit further prosecution.

The present Amendment revises claim 1 to further describe the signals emitted by the transmitter modules. It also revises claim 1 to specify a feature that can be used to identify the particular transmitter module that emitted a signal. In particular, claim 1 now recites that the receiving signal processing network "calculates a search range for each receiver during which the next burst transmission of the characteristic transmission pattern of the same mobile transmitter module is expected to arrive, the search range having a duration that is substantially longer than the duration of the burst transmissions" (the other independent claim set been revised in similar manner). This is supported (for example) by Figure 2 of the application's drawings, and by the paragraph bridging pages 11 and 12 of the specification.

The present Amendment also revises the dependent claims where appropriate to conform them to the new languages in the independent claims, simplifies the claim language at several places, and deletes unnecessary limitations.

The Office Action rejects all of the independent claims (along with number of dependent claims) for obviousness based on Wadell et al in view of Scott et al. For the sake of convenient discussion, these references will hereafter be simply "Wadell" and "Scott." For the reasons discussed below, it is respectfully submitted that the independent claims as currently formulated are patentable over these references.

Claim 1 provides that transmitter modules that are attached to mobile modules transmit signals within a frequency band "that is used as a single channel without a feedback channel." On page 2, the Office Action takes the position that a passage in the paragraph of Wadell that bridges column 1 and 2 discloses a broadcast mode. However, an ordinarily skilled person would understand that the paragraph of Wadell in question discusses fixed timing reference transmitters, not transmitter modules that are attached to mobile objects. Furthermore, the paragraph bridging Wadell's columns 1 and 2 describes spread-spectrum signals, and an ordinarily skilled person would be aware of the common practice of using a

feedback channel to control the transmission power of mobile spread-spectrum transmitters. It is worth noting that Wadell's preferred embodiment uses spread-spectrum transceivers that are attached to his objects. In short, it is respectfully submitted that Wadell would not have taught an ordinarily skilled person to omit a feedback channel from transmitters attached to mobile objects in a tracking system.

On page 2, the Office Action also comments that "no feedback channel can also equate to a half-duplex operation whereby there are not two simultaneous channels." Applicant respectfully disagrees. The claims language "without a feedback channel" clearly means that there is no channel for feeding back data to the transmitter modules, regardless of when this may occur.

Claim 1 now also provides that each mobile transmitter module emits a characteristic transmission pattern having a sequence of burst transmissions that occur at pseudo-random times, and that a search range during which the next burst transmission of the characteristic transmission pattern of the same transmitter module is expected to arrive at each receiver is calculated. Claim 1 also recite that the search range has duration " that is substantially longer than the duration of the burst transmissions." The use of a search range that is substantially greater in duration than the burst transmissions means that a window can be established for receiving the next scheduled burst from a giving transmitter module, regardless of whether it is moving forward a receiver or away from the receiver. It is respectfully submitted that an ordinarily skilled person who wanted to improve Wadell in some matter would not achieve the search range of claim 1 even if this ordinarily skilled person looked to the Scott reference for guidance. That is, nothing in Scott's use of time-hopping TDMA time slots would have provided a motivation for an ordinarily skilled person to modify Wadell so as to achieve a tracking system in which search ranges are established for detecting burst that occur at pseudo-random times in characteristic transmission patterns of transmitter modules.

It is also respectfully submitted that the inventions defined by independent claims 20 and 22-24 are patentable over Wadell and Scott for reasons along the lines discussed above with respect to claim 1. As for the dependent claims, they are patentable along with their

independent claims, even apart from the additional limitations that they add in order to further define the invention.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Allen Wood
Registration No. 28,134
Customer No. 23995
(202) 326-0222
(202) 408-0924 (facsimile)

AW:ss

*I certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (fax no. 571-273-8300) on June 20, 2006.*

*Allen Wood (reg. no. 28,134)* *Signature:*

Date: June 20, 2006